

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Editor.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
PUBLISHERS: LUCAS, KIRBY, THOMAS COFFEY,
Messrs. LUCAS, KIRBY, JOHN NICHOL,
and J. J. NEVEN, are fully authorized to receive
subscriptions and transact all other business
for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each
insertion, agents measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Arch-
bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St.
Boniface, and the Bishops of London, Hamilton
and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the
Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as
well as that having reference to business, should
be directed to the proprietor, and must reach
London not later than Tuesday morning.
Arrears must be paid in full before the paper
can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Feb. 17, 1894.

THE MISSION.

On last Sunday, in St. Peter's cathedral, His Lordship the Bishop of London once more referred to the spiritual retreat which is to begin in the cathedral parish on next Sunday, conducted by Rev. Fathers Doherty and O'Brien of the Jesuit order. His Lordship expressed the hope that the blessings and benefits to be derived from this retreat would reach all the members of the congregation, and trusted that at its close not even one Catholic in London could be found who had not made his peace with God. It is to be hoped that His Lordship's anticipations will be fully realized. To the laity belongs largely the success of the mission, for many stray sheep could be brought into the fold by the kindly exhortation of one neighbor to another.

Catholics have reason to be proud of their faith; and by punctual attendance at all the exercises of this mission they will fully realize what a glorious privilege is theirs to be numbered amongst the flock so zealously guarded and tenderly cared for by the Spouse of Christ.

THE MAIL AND THE PARISH.

The Toronto Mail takes very much to heart the financial interests of the habitants of Quebec, and is very desirous of emancipating them from the incubus of the clergy who are represented as endeavoring to crush them under a heavy burden of taxation for the purpose of building unnecessary costly churches. It tells us in a recent issue:

"In Quebec the habitants or farmers cannot afford to participate in provincial taxation; but the clergy never consider them too poor to build a new church or to enlarge an old one. For many years the people yielded to the church building rage; but now they are showing signs of rebellion. Despite the decisions of the Bishops on these undertakings, and in face also of the rule that the faithful must obey orders, there has been evinced a growing indisposition to incur the new financial responsibilities which the enterprises impose."

We are then treated to a disquisition on the several instances where there have been conflicts between the pastors and people in regard to the erection of new churches. But curiously enough, by going back for several years, the Mail is able to produce only three instances where disputes have occurred, which, after all, do not amount to very many amid a population of 1,291,709 Catholics, even if they were as serious as they are represented by that journal to be.

It is not to be expected that in so extensive a territory as Quebec, and amid so large a population, there should never be a difference of opinion in regard to the advisability of building new churches, or as to the style of building which might be suitable. Such disputes are frequent in Ontario among the Protestant population and frequently give rise to schisms, temporary or permanent, as the case may be; and as human nature is pretty much the same everywhere, we cannot be very much surprised that there should be differences of opinion on such matters between the Catholic people of Quebec. It is, on the contrary, remarkable that the cases of this kind are so few that their apparent importance arises merely out of the parade made of them in the columns of the Mail from day to day.

One of these instances occurred in the county of Maskinonge, where a few of the parishioners opposed the decree of the Bishop to build a church for a newly-erected parish. These individuals erected a small building for themselves, and obtained for a while the ministrations of one of the priests, but as the Bishop would not permit the unnecessary division of the congregation in this manner, the use of this building as a church was forbidden, whereupon eleven of the dissatisfied ones publicly proclaimed their adhesion to the Baptists, and procured the services of a Baptist preacher.

The Mail represents this instance of

the obstinacy of a few mutinous members as a revolt of "the congregation," and "the transference of the congregation to the Baptist communion."

It is thus only by misrepresentation of facts that the Mail can make it appear that the people of Quebec are in rebellion against the ecclesiastical authorities.

As the county of Maskinonge has hitherto contained a population of 17,779 Catholics, and only 50 Protestants of all denominations, any event which on a sudden adds 22 per cent. to the Protestant population of the county is deemed to be one of immense importance, though it is a remarkable fact that the dissenters did not join themselves with any of the Protestant sects already existing in the county—but oh! We notice by the census figures that there was one Baptist in the county previously! The Baptists may therefore boast that there has been suddenly an increase in their numbers of 110 per cent. though the Catholics will scarcely feel the loss of a few members who for the most part were never very fervent in their devotedness to their religion.

A second instance in which the Mail lays great stress in that which recently occurred in the parish of Montebello, in Ottawa county. This case is so fresh in the minds of our readers that it is scarcely necessary to recall the circumstances. We shall, therefore, merely mention briefly that the wealthy seigneur, Mr. L. J. Papineau, who has not been a practical Catholic in the past, but has freely declared himself to be an adherent of the Free-thinking school, suddenly finds that he is not permitted to dictate to his Bishop, his parish priest and the Catholics of the parish, how the Church temporalities are to be managed. Mr. Papineau's only claim to rule the Church is that he is his father's son; yet even the father was no more a practical Catholic than has been the son. It does not appear that even one of the parishioners sided with Mr. Papineau in opposing the erection of a new church, so that the question at issue was whether Mr. Papineau's will was to override that of the whole congregation, together with the ecclesiastical authorities. Because he could not rule, he has joined with the five Presbyterians who were in Montebello before. This is the case on which the Mail rests its terrible indictment against the Church in Lower Canada, that she is engaged in the work of imposing insupportable burdens on the people in the form of taxes. We presume that the people of Montebello know what they are capable of as well as the Mail; and if they could not build the new church they would not undertake it, as they seem to be willing to do. Mr. Papineau may find it as difficult to rule his five new brothers in religion as he found it to carry out his will in the teeth of the Catholic people of his parish.

The third instance adduced in this connection occurred at Pike River. Here there was a real disagreement between the desires of the clergy and the majority of the people; but unfortunately for the Mail's case it is acknowledged that the difficulty is probably on the point of being amicably settled by "a compromise." We do not deny that differences of opinion on such matters may exist, but the present position shows that there exists a commendable reasonableness on both sides to arrange such matters without pushing them to extremes, so that the Mail's comments and conclusions are not justified by the real facts.

We have said that the Mail could only find three instances of dissension on this subject by going back for a period of several years. It is true two other cases are referred to, one of which occurs at Nicolet, and the other at Beaumont, in the county of Belleschasse; but as it is admitted that the people are not objecting to the proposed improvements in either of these cases, it cannot be truly said there is dissension in the matter at all, so that the Mail, in its grief that there is nothing of the kind, makes the lugubrious remark that, "It would be assuming a partisan position were it to be said that the people in (Beaumont) instance deserve to win."

Such are the proofs which the Mail gathers out of all the parishes of Quebec to prove that the Catholic people there "are showing signs of rebellion" against the ecclesiastical authorities. We imagine that all the rebellion that is going on can be settled without the Mail's arbitration or interference. The desire of the clergy to impose heavy burdens upon the people is but a myth which does not deserve to be refuted seriously,

A PREPOSTEROUS SUGGESTION.

A French-Canadian correspondent, writing from Kansas, says Mr. Papineau ought to be elected to Parliament as recognition of his bold vindication of religious liberty, as a solace for his vile treatment at the hands of the enemies of liberty, and that the Protestant French-Canadians may at last have representation in Parliament. Our correspondent does not seem to remember that the Protestant French-Canadians have enjoyed no mean share of representation in Parliament if Mr. Joly is to be counted as one of them, as he has always desired to be. Mr. Auger, long member of Parliament for Shefford, is also a very devout Protestant. It would be entirely unfair to hold the French-Canadian people guilty of the diatribes which have been dictated to the French press.—Montreal Witness, 7th Feb.

We notice with pleasure the kindly spirit in which the above words were penned by our esteemed contemporary, and we fully admit that some of the French papers in the sister Province from time to time indulge in ebullitions of bad temper, which ill befit serious and influential journals. We are pleased to see that the Witness does not, like some of our Ontario journals, represent these unbecoming manifestations as indications of chronic ill-will on the part of the French-Canadian people against the Protestants of their Province.

The facts mentioned by our contemporary prove that such ill-will on the part of French-Canadians does not exist. At the same time we deem it our duty to point out that there is a palliation if not complete justification for the occasional outbreaks of anger on the part of the French press in the persistence with which a considerable section of the English press endeavor to excite the worst passions of the Protestant majority in the Dominion against, not only the French-Canadians, but also against the whole Catholic population. The English papers which do this habitually are not confined either to Ontario, but are sufficiently numerous in Quebec itself to do much mischief; and it is a natural result that there should be some anger shown by the abused ones when unreasonable threats and misrepresentations are uttered against them.

It must be remembered too that the threats and misrepresentations which are uttered so freely against the French-Canadians especially, are not trifling or unimportant. They are the indications of a fixed policy on the part of a considerable permanent party in both Provinces which glories in the shame of being a party of persecution. It is all the more provoking that there is a constant danger that this party, unceasingly aggressive as it is, may become dominant in the most powerful Province of our union.

There is not, and there never has been, in Quebec, a party whose aim it was to ostracise and disfranchise the Protestants or any sect of Protestants. In Ontario, however, there has nearly always been such a party against Catholics, since it became an English-speaking Province. Even though we now freely accord to the Montreal Witness the praise due it for discountenancing the most recent anti-Catholic movement of the P. P. A., we cannot forget entirely that it has encouraged the similar movements of days past, even so recently as that of the Equal Rights and the McCarthys. Other journals have not been even so reasonable as the Witness; and it is not to be wondered at that the French press sometimes forget themselves and use weapons somewhat similar to those of their assailants. Yet the accusation of the Witness is too general when it charges the French press as a whole with ill-will, as it does in the above-quoted paragraph.

For our own part, while we have firmly maintained Catholic principles and rights, and have refused to be cowed by the threats of adversaries, such as those of Mr. D'Alton McCarthy uttered at St. Thomas and elsewhere, we have always endeavored to avoid returning railing for railing. The Witness points out that French constituencies have habitually shown their liberality by electing Protestants, English or French, to Parliament or the Local Legislature without regard to difference of religion.

This is sufficient evidence of the liberality of the French-Canadians, notwithstanding the attacks made upon them on the ground of nationality and religion. It is very seldom that Protestant constituencies show similar consideration, and we presume that while the wave of bigotry raised under the present fanatical crusade continues, this will occur more seldom still. We do not for an instant imagine that there will be any sym-

thetic wave of opposition to Protestants in Quebec on account of this, for, we must say it, Catholics are not so easily moved to manifestations of bigotry.

We must add a word on the suggestion of the Kansas correspondent of the Witness that Mr. Papineau "ought to be elected to Parliament," because of his renunciation of what little Catholic faith was in him. This is rather too much to expect from a Catholic people, and the Witness with a good deal of common sense virtually admits that such is the case.

It is pretty well settled in Canada that a man's religion should not be a bar to his political advancement, if he be otherwise qualified for preferment. The P. P. A. are the only ones who openly ostracise any one on account of his religious belief; but it is going a little too far to maintain that a man ought to be sent to Parliament because he belongs to some sect in particular. Still more preposterous is it to suppose that a Catholic constituency ought to elect such a one simply because he has renounced his religion, even if his motives were the purest imaginable, which we have good reason to believe was not the case with Mr. Papineau.

The county of Ottawa, where Mr. Papineau resides, contains 51,460 Catholics out of a total population of 68,560. We are not told that Mr. Papineau has any peculiar fitness to be the representative of the county or any part of it, and we presume if he had it he might have been its representative before now. The Kansas correspondent must surely be poking fun at the readers of the Witness when suggesting that as soon as he becomes a Presbyterian he becomes endowed with all the qualities which should fit him for such a position. There are, indeed, five Quebec counties in which the Protestants are in a majority, small or large; but the Protestants of Quebec, having practical experience of the generosity and liberality of their French-Canadian neighbors, are not of the fanatical class out of which P. P. A. are made, and they are not likely to make a hero out of a man who has no other claim upon them than that he has become a Protestant because he has the personal pique that he could not force his will upon the Catholic congregation to which he had hitherto belonged.

It will be remembered that the treatment which Dr. Carman, of Montreal, and members of the P. P. A. generally propose for the Premier of the Dominion is very different from that proposed by the Kansas correspondent for Mr. Papineau, though the fitness of the former for the position he occupies is not denied by any one. Everything seems to depend upon the color of the spectacles through which these matters are looked at.

THE GERMAN EMPEROR AND PRINCE BISMARCK.

The reconciliation of Prince Bismarck and the Emperor William is still a theme of much talk in Germany. There is no doubt that even during the period of estrangement Bismarck continued to be the most popular man in the Empire, the gratitude of the people towards him being manifested whenever an opportunity was afforded to display it. This feeling prevented any close criticism of his arbitrary conduct during his occupancy of the Chancellorship. The greatest enthusiasm was displayed on the occasion of the Prince's visit to Berlin to see the Emperor, on invitation of the latter, and it is believed that the Emperor will return the visit very soon. Bismarck expects this return visit, and his residence at Friedrichsruhe is being now prepared for the great occasion.

In spite of all the outward jubilation it is well known that Bismarck is grievously disappointed because his visit to Berlin took place in a style so different from what he expected when four years ago he left Berlin exclaiming "the Emperor shall see me again." It is true, the Emperor has seen him again, and received him cordially, but he thought that the reception would have been of a very different character from what it really was. He imagined, like Owen Glendower, he could "call spirits from the vasty deep," and that they would at once come at the call to do his will, to make or unmake dynasties. His disappointment is proportionately great as he finds that this is not the case.

Instead of returning as a dictator, he still remains a private citizen, glad to bask in the sunshine of the Emperor's friendship. Outwardly, at least, the Emperor appears to be highly delighted at being reconciled with the prince. Thus, on

the occasion of his receiving the report of General Von Shellenhoff, the Minister of War, on the state of the army, a few days ago, when the general thanked him on behalf of the army for having brought about the reconciliation, he asked, in a tone which indicated real pleasure,

"What? is the army also pleased?"

It is still notorious that there is not any cordial feeling between Bismarck and the members of Chancellor Von Caprivi's ministry, and none of them visited him in Berlin except Von Caprivi himself, who was obliged to do so to keep up appearances, inasmuch as Bismarck was the Emperor's guest. Count Eulenbergh, the President of the Prussian Ministry, was also one of his visitors, but beyond these he received no Government officials at all.

It is not expected even by Bismarck himself that the festivities which were held in his honor will result in his resumption of the Chancellorship, or of any position in the Government; hence he is careful to make it known that his age and health will not permit him to undertake any such onerous duties. His opposition to the liberal and moderate views of the Emperor is the real cause which makes him now a governmental impossibility, and even the people understand this fully while they regard him with gratitude because of his successful efforts to bring about the unity of the Empire after having taken so active a part in bringing the Franco-German conflict to a termination so satisfactory to Germany, or at least to Prussia.

THE COERCION BUGBEAR.

The Mail has been for several years occupying itself with efforts to prove that the Catholic Separate School Law of Ontario is coercive, obliging Catholics to become Separate school supporters; but of late articles after articles have appeared in its columns to prove this point, and that Sir Oliver Mowat is to be censured for having made the law in this way.

In fact we would have no objection, nor would Catholics in general have any objection, to offer if such were really the case. Hence we have not considered it necessary to pay any attention to the Mail's sayings on this matter, conscious as we are of the folly of that contention. Every one who has read the law even in the most cursory manner is quite aware that it is not in the least degree coercive in the sense asserted by the Mail, and they who have had practical experience of the working of the law are perfectly aware that it is rather coercive in the direction opposite to that indicated. That journal must either rely very much on the obtuseness of its readers, or be very obtuse itself to maintain such a proposition. Thus we find the statement in an article published only a few days ago:

"With reference to the Separate School Law the complaint (of the Mail) is that in its operation it treats all Roman Catholics as Separate school supporters whether they care to be such or not, and that at bottom it is coercive."

"At bottom," forsooth! This is surely a slight departure from the original contention that the law is actually and strongly coercive. But at the top it appears there is no coercion. Perhaps the Mail will inform us which is the top and which the bottom of the law, then we may keep at the top and avoid the coercion on which the Mail is constantly harping, but at present we are quite in the dark as to its meaning.

There is coercion, however, on the Protestant ratepayers to support the Public schools, even when they prefer to send their children to the Separate schools, and we know of a number of instances where Protestants send their children to Separate schools, while paying their taxes to the Public schools which they are coerced into supporting. Moreover, in every instance of this kind which we have known, the Catholic trustees have generously allowed these children to attend their schools without charge, and no such fuss was ever made about the matter, as the Public School Board made in Toronto a few weeks ago about a few Catholic children who chanced to attend the Toronto night schools.

But a few lines below the statement that Catholics are "at bottom" coerced into supporting Separate schools, the Mail admits that they are not coerced at all! It tells us that "Dr. O'Sullivan, it seems, rose in the House during the discussion of Mr. Crooks' School Bill, and moved that every Roman Catholic should be deemed ipso facto a Separate school supporter."

The Mail denies that the Hon. C. Fraser "at once took the ground that

such an amendment would be unconstitutional." It adds that Mr. Fraser's words were, "he hoped care would be taken in dealing with this bill, as he did not want the question of constitutionality raised at any future time."

There appears to be no substantial difference between the two statements, the important point being that the motion was not passed, and so there is no such "coercion" as the Mail has conjured up as a bogey for the detection or terror of P. P. A. readers. Mr. Crooks, however, opposed Dr. Sullivan's motion on the ground that "the amendment would elevate the Separate school system into a rival of the Public schools." Surely this language does not imply a very great desire to give Separate schools extraordinary privileges.

We may add here that a careful reading of the Confederation Act seems to us to give the meaning which Mr. Fraser intimated that Catholics could not be coerced into becoming Separate school supporters, even if an Act were passed to this effect by the Legislature. But as there is no such Act, the question is not a practical one.

But the Mail has discovered another mare's nest in the matter: "Dr. O'Sullivan said that as he had received the assurances of the Minister of Education that justice would be done to Separate schools, he would consent to withdraw the amendment, which was done accordingly." It continues: "Now the Globe does not favor us with this last speech of Dr. O'Sullivan, which is the keynote to the situation."

Here we find also the keynote to the Mail's objections. That journal is not satisfied that "justice should be done to Separate schools." Its whole efforts are directed towards doing them injustice. Entrap the Separate school supporters by means of legal quibbles, so that the Public schools may gobble up their taxes, and starve out the Separate schools by robbing them of money which belongs to them by every rule of justice and equity. This is the policy which the Mail has been advocating for years, but without success. The people of Ontario have twice condemned this policy at the polls, but the recent rise of the P. P. A. has given the Mail renewed hope that if persevered in it may be successful at the next election. There is an obstacle in the way, however, which will effectually prevent it from being carried out: the clause of the Confederation Act which removes from the Local Legislature the power of taking from the Catholic minority the rights they possessed before Confederation. The Mail's followers are well aware of this, and the Rev. Mr. Madill, the new President of the P. P. A., declared in an interview with a Globe reporter, just after his election, that it will be the aim of the P. P. A. to change the constitution so that this organization may be able to wipe out Catholic schools entirely. That is to say, the whole Confederation Act is to be upset in order to gratify the P. P. A. It may be taken for granted that if they were to succeed in their purpose, the Protestant Separate schools of Quebec would be swept away by the same tornado which would destroy the Catholic school system of Ontario. Indeed the Confederation itself would be destroyed; but it is not to be supposed for a moment that the fanaticism of thirty or thirty-five thousand Ontarians, or only a certain fraction of whom are voters, will be allowed to control the whole Dominion with its population of nearly five million souls. The British Parliament would never consent for the sake of a few fanatics to destroy the fabric which makes of Canada a real and prosperous nationality. We can, therefore, afford to smile at the frantic ravings of the Mail and its correspondents, and of the conspirators who had not the courage to acknowledge their own identity at the recent convention held in Hamilton.

The Mail tells us, further, that under Sir Oliver Mowat's regime "it was ordered that the assessors should rank all Roman Catholics as Separate school supporters without even a by your leave," as the law of 1879 directs "that the assessor shall accept the statement of, or on behalf of, any ratepayer that he is a Roman Catholic as sufficient prima facie evidence for placing him in the Separate school column" and "if the assessor knows personally any ratepayer to be a Roman Catholic, this also shall be sufficient for placing him in such last mentioned column."

It is very true that this law passed, and that to a cursory reader it appears to give a valuable privilege to Separate schools; but even if it did so it would be only fair, inasmuch as

Catholics, almost desire to support where they exist hardship, therefore Catholics are *prima facie* Separate schools.

But the Mail is the judges have apparently generous a nothing. It to place any Separate school before given notice desires his name. That the Mail is the case is clear from the matter was fully in its columns, a tilted. We cannot present renewal of tions as anything honesty.

One more extra article, and we shall state that "the above extract" be apparent when first, that the demand ceased, and, secondly, school press, which control, accepts it. Surely a conv Catholics are favored cause they are wish of the Mail that we should always grumbling we might expect. wise legislation to are legislated for, contented, but who object of the law, ing yoke to satisfy aties.

We must add, Mail's argument premises are false law because we citizens; but we advantages are g schools which the law were perfect Protestant majority thoroughly in ea justice by giving opportunity we improve our schools.

THE CO-

Some of our wonder why the R columns to the P. Aism. It seem that is destined speedily, and with part. We have no deemed it a duty against the men dissensions between foment hatred and We, in a frank and the tenets of its them up for the all who love truth not for the allevia sorrows of humani cation of a reli understand, and method that villal destruction, politi of lawing-abidin, obliged to have weapon they fear.

And our task, some, has been We have enlighte real aims of this we have revealed awakened the in detest unreasoni ence charity.

Some of its ad that it is an merely for politia have it secret? hardly tonable w its main object is of their political ment of their rel even of their prop

But enough. Our separated bro scorn upon the of the P. P. A. touch with metho but little credit times. True to t they respect tho theirs, and they brother citizens they may lay law

Hence many ha nounce this org liberty, a barrie menace to our pr of Myron Reed, p gregationalist chv ad, speaking agitators on the profit by Canadi

"Take this A. is there anybody is twaddle about Why some of the in Denver are C